

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 15-24, and 28-40 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 6 and 20 to further clarify the invention. In addition, Applicant amends claim 21 for reasons of precision of language and consistency. Finally, Applicant rewrites claims 8 and 22 into their independent form.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks the Examiner for confirming that "Notice of References Cited" box on form PTOL-326 was in error. An Examiner's Interview Summary Record (PTO-413) was faxed on August 24, 2004. The PTO-413 requires applicant to file a Statement of Substance of the Interview. The Statement of Substance of the Interview is as follows: notice of references cited box was checked in error and no new references are enclosed with Final Office Action dated June 16, 2004.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging that claims 12-14 and 25-27 are canceled. Applicant also thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 1-5, 15-19, and 28-40, and for indicating that claims 8-11 and 22-24 contain allowable subject matter.

Claims 8 and 22 are rewritten into independent claims and are broadened for more varied protection. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that they are patentable at least by virtue of their recitation of an instruction entering means comprising "a main instruction entering level for performing a plurality of different kinds of analyses, and a common instruction entering level to

be utilized commonly for said plurality of different kinds of analyses,” as acknowledged by the Examiner on page 2 of the Office Action. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to allow claims 8 and 22, and their dependent claims 9-11 and 23-24, respectively.

Rejections

The remaining rejected claims 6, 7, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,923,365 to Tamir et al. (hereinafter “Tamir”). Of these claims, only claims 6 and 20 are independent. Independent claim 6, among a number of unique features, recites: “wherein said interface means is operable to convert said inputted data into each of a chart, a numerical list, an image, and a video.”

Tamir teaches a video manipulating system for manipulating the representation of a sporting event. In particular, Tamir teaches that a user selects (highlights) an object or a region at a certain frame and this object is traced throughout the entire video. The user can choose to view a video clip of this object or to see a still image of the entire event superimposing acts that occurred at different time points on the same global background image (col. 13, lines 40 to 65). The system is capable of detecting fusion, splitting and occlusion of the object (col. 10, lines 15 to 35). Fig. 2 of Tamir shows tracking of the selected object on the consecutive frames. Fig. 2 is a past trajectory superimposed on a video (col. 8, lines 5 to 10).

Tamir, however, is no different from the prior art disclosed in the Applicant’s background of the invention. That is, Tamir’s system enables a simple analysis for positioning and movement of individual players. Tamir’s system traces user selected object from frame to

frame by using conventional edge algorithms such as edge detection, thresholding, and continuity (col. 9, lines 4 to 30). In other words, Tamir teaches displaying a video clip or a number of still images superimposed on the same global background image.

Assuming *arguendo* that a plurality of still images can be compared to a data list, as alleged by the Examiner on page 4 of the Office Action, Tamir still fails to disclose converting the selected data into a chart. In addition, Tamir teaches a number of images and not a numerical list. In Tamir, the D/A image converter converts the selected data into a video standard format to display a video clip or an image. In short, Tamir fails to teach or suggest a converter operable to convert selected data into a chart or a numerical list. Tamir's system is designed for monitoring the movement of the object and not for statistical analysis where a chart or a numerical list would be utilized.

Therefore, "wherein said interface means is operable to convert said inputted data into each of a chart, a numerical list, an image, and a video," as set forth in claim 6 is not disclosed by Tamir, which lacks having a converter capable or operable to convert the inputted data into this variety of forms. For at least these exemplary reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 6 is patentably distinguishable from Tamir and claim 7 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 6. Therefore, it is appropriate and necessary for the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claims 6 and 7.

Next, independent claim 20, among a number of unique features, recites: "wherein when said entered instruction is a first type of instructions, said processed data is converted into a

graph, when said entered instruction is a second type of instruction, said processed data is converted into a chart, when said entered instruction is a third type of instruction, said processed data is converted into a list, when said entered instruction is a fourth type of instruction, said processed data is converted into an image or a video.”

As discussed above, Tamir only teaches converting data (user selected object) received from the highlighter into a video standard format to display a video clip or a number of still images. Tamir, however, fails to disclose, based on the type of the instruction, converting data into a variety of forms such as a chart, a graph and so on. Tamir deals with monitoring the movement of objects, whereas these forms of representation (charts, graphs, etc.) are associated with statistical analysis and are clearly absent from Tamir’s teachings. For at least these exemplary reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 is patentably distinguishable from Tamir and claim 21 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claims 20 and 21.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No.: 09/919,989

Attorney Docket No.: Q65606

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard C. Turner
Registration No. 29,710

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 16, 2004

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q65606

KONISHI, KENTARO, et al.

Appln. No.: 09/919,989

Group Art Unit: 2671

Confirmation No.: 6406

Examiner: Lance W. Sealey

Filed: July 30, 2001

For: TIME-SERIES DATA PROCESSING DEVICE AND METHOD

EXCESS CLAIM FEE PAYMENT LETTER

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED

SEP 17 2004

Technology Center 2600

Sir:

An Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is attached hereto for concurrent filing in the above-identified application. The resulting excess claim fee has been calculated as shown below:

(Small Entity fees apply):

	After Amendment		Highest No. Previously Paid For					
All Claims	34	-	40	=	X	\$9.00	=	\$0.00
Independent	10	-	8	=	2 X	\$43.00	=	\$86.00
TOTAL							=	\$86.00

A check for the statutory fee of \$86.00 is attached. The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account. A duplicate copy of this letter is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard C. Turner
Registration No. 29,710

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 16, 2004